

**Atty. Docket No. IDF 1415 (4000-00900)****Patent****REMARKS*****Status of claims***

Claims 1-14 are currently pending in this application.

Applicants hereby request further examination and reconsideration of the presently claimed application.

***35 USC § 103 Rejection***

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over *Hartley* (6,532,465) in view of *Dong* (6,499,023) and further in view of *Lipkin* (6,721,747). Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over *Hartley* (6,532,465) in view of *McComb* (6,006,224) and further in view of *Lipkin* (6,721,747). Claims 5 and 10 stand further rejected under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over *Hartley* (6,532,465) in view of *Dong* (6,499,023) further in view of *Lipkin* (6,721,747), and further in view of *Brownell* (6,009,266).

In the Office Action mailed March 4, 2005, the Examiner asserts that the previous declaration is deficient in that it does not provide actual dates relied upon to establish diligence. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, and direct the Examiner's attention to the fact that Applicants are providing a Rule 1.131 declaration to establish an actual reduction to practice prior to the effective filing date of *Lipkin*, rather than a declaration to establish conception prior to *Lipkin* followed by a reduction to practice after *Lipkin*. Nonetheless, in an effort to substantively advance prosecution, Applicants provide herewith another Declaration Under Rule 1.131 of inventor Kemi Ibitayo setting forth additional statements of fact related to the actual reduction to practice of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the enclosed declaration clearly establishes that the invention claimed in the present application was actually reduced to practice prior to January 14, 2000, which is the effective date of *Lipkin*. Therefore, *Lipkin* is no longer available as a prior art reference, and given such, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obvious does not exist as to the pending claims.

*Atty. Docket No. IDF 1415 (4000-00900)**Patent***CONCLUSION**

Consideration of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the application, and withdrawal of the rejections and objections is respectfully requested by Applicants. No new matter is introduced by way of the amendment. It is believed that each ground of rejection raised in the Final Office Action dated March 4, 2005 has been fully addressed. If any fee is due as a result of the filing of this paper, please appropriately charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 21-0765, Sprint. If a petition for extension of time is necessary in order for this paper to be deemed timely filed, please consider this a petition therefore.

If a telephone conference would facilitate the resolution of any issue or expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below.


Respectfully submitted,

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.

Date:

5-26-05

5700 Granite Parkway, #330  
Plano, Texas 75024  
Telephone: (972) 731-2288  
Facsimile: (972) 731-2289

  
Rodney B. Carroll  
Reg. No. 39,624

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS